



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,815	09/18/2003	Yen-Fu Chen	AUS920030587US1	8941

45371 7590 08/07/2007  
IBM CORPORATION (RUS)  
c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLp  
2100 Ross Avenue  
Suite 2600  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
----------

NEWAY, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/07/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/666,815	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Samuel G. Neway	<b>Art Unit</b> 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18, 20-23, 26, 27 and 29-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18, 20-23, 26, 27 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is responsive to the Amendment filed on 29 May 2007.
2. Claims 1 – 15, 18, 20 – 23, 26 – 27, and 29 – 31 are still pending.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 1, 15, and 23 recite “acquiring a original database script”. This is believed to be a typographical error for ‘acquiring an original database script’.
4. Claims 6, 13, 21, and 30 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claims 6, 13, 21, and 30 recite the limitation “copying the database script”. This limitation has been added to the amended independent claims.

5. Claims 26 – 27, and 29 – 31 are dependent on claim 23, which is directed to a “computer readable medium”. However, claims 26 – 27, and 29 – 31 are all directed to a “GUI”.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2626

7. Claims 1 – 15, 18, 20 – 23, 26 – 27, and 29 – 31 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 23 recite “substituting a source language string literal in the copied database script with a label, thereby creating a message file; using a translation data file to translate the source language string literal in the message file with a target language string literal, thereby creating a label file” (emphasis added).

The message file created by substituting a source language string literal by a label, so the message file does not contain the string literal anymore since it has been replaced by the label. It is unclear how it is the source language string literal can be translated in the message file when there is no string literal in the message file.

The Examiner will interpret these limitations as creating a message file separate from the copied database script, the message file containing both the label and the source language string literal.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 5 – 8, and 12 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barker et al (USPN 7,177,793).

Claim 1:

Barker discloses a method comprising:

acquiring an original database script in a source language (Fig. 1, item 130 and related text);

copying the original database script to create a copied database script (Fig. 1, item 135 and related text);

substituting a source language string literal in the copied database script with a label ("extracting translatable strings .... " col. 2, lines 41-46, "a unique identifier is assigned to each translatable string ", col. 2, lines 48),

creating a message file containing the source language string literal and its corresponding label ("identifier is included in the ... various translation files ", col. 2, lines 49-50);

using a translation data file to translate the source language string literal in the message file with a target language string literal, thereby creating a label file ("a particular translated string can be found in one of the translation files", col. 2, lines 50-52);

and substituting the label in the database script with the target language string literal in the label file ("When display text, ... is retrieved the identifier is located ...", col. 2, lines 53-55)

whereby a translated database is produced ("Translated strings can be gathered for display panels when the product is packaged", col. 2, lines 58-59).

Claim 5:

Barker discloses the method of claim 1, Barker further discloses running the database script to create a target language database (col. 2, lines 59-61).

Claim 6:

Barker discloses the method of claim 1 comprising copying the database script (Fig. 1, item 135 and related text).

Claim 7:

Barker discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the source language is English (col. 3, lines 1-4).

Claims 8 and 12 – 14:

Claims 8 and 12 – 14 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 and 5 – 7 and are rejected with the same rationale.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2 – 4, 9 – 11, 15, 18, 20 – 23, 26 – 27, and 29 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al (USPN 7,177,793) in view of Heiny (USPN 5,778,356).

Claim 2:

Barker discloses the method of claim 1 but it does not explicitly disclose:  
adjusting the field width in the database script.

Heiny, in a similar method of displaying string in a plurality of languages, discloses adjusting the field width in the database script ("parts in the database may be repositioned within the schema hierarchy as well as being modified, added, and deleted", col.6, lines 53-55).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the field width in order to correctly display strings in different languages. The width of a string is not necessarily the same as the width of its translated counterpart; therefore it is obvious to make the width adjustable in order to properly display the strings in different languages.

Claim 3:

Barker and Heiny disclose the method of claim 2, Heiny further discloses wherein the adjusting occurs without user intervention ("provide flexibility in allocating storage space for the character strings ... ", col.14, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the width automatically in order to speed up the process.

Claim 4:

Barker and Heiny discloses the method of claim 2, Heiny further discloses wherein the adjusting the field width step comprises: analyzing a database script to determine the maximum width of each field; displaying a list of fields, field widths, and maximum field widths (Fig. 12 and related text); and allowing a user to modify a field width ("users are able to change the parts schema ... ", col. 6, lines 50-52).

Art Unit: 2626

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the field width in order to correctly display strings in different languages. The width of a string is not necessarily the same as the width of its translation in another language; therefore it is obvious to make the width adjustable in order to properly display the strings in different languages.

Claim 15:

Barker discloses a method comprising:

acquiring an original database script in a source language (Fig. 1, item 130 and related text);

copying the original database script to create a copied database script (Fig. 1, item 135 and related text);

substituting a source language string literal in the copied database script with a label ("a unique identifier is assigned to each translatable string ", col. 2, lines 48),

creating a message file containing a source language string literal and its corresponding label ("identifier is included in the ... various translation files ", col. 2, lines 49-50);

using a translation data file to translate the source language string literal in the message file with a target language string literal, thereby creating a label file ("a particular translated string can be found in one of the translation files", col. 2, lines 50-52);



Art Unit: 2626

and substituting the label in the database script with the target language string literal in the label file ("When display text, ... is retrieved the identifier is located ...", col. 2, lines 53-55)

whereby a translated database is produced ("Translated strings can be gathered for display panels when the product is packaged", col. 2, lines 58-59).

Heiny, in a similar method of displaying string in a plurality of languages, discloses adjusting the field width in the database script ("parts in the database may be repositioned within the schema hierarchy as well as being modified, added, and deleted", col.6, lines 53-55). Heiny further discloses wherein the adjusting the field width step comprises: analyzing a database script to determine the maximum width of each field; displaying a list of fields, field widths, and maximum field widths (Fig. 12 and related text); and allowing a user to modify a field width ("users are able to change the parts schema ... ", col. 6, lines 50-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the field width in order to correctly display strings in different languages. The width of a string is not necessarily the same as the width of its translation in another language; therefore it is obvious to make the width adjustable in order to properly display the strings in different languages.

Claims 18, and 20 – 22:

Claims 18, and 20 – 22 are similar in scope and content to claims 3, and 5 – 7 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 23, 26 – 27, and 29 – 31:

Claims 23, 26 – 27, and 29 – 31 are similar in scope and content to claims 15, 18, and 20 – 22 and are rejected with the same rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2626

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SN



DAVID HUDSPETH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2